

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700119

A. Statement of Planning Objectives

The BLM Ridgecrest Field Office (RFO) is located in the western Mojave Desert and is a transition zone between the West Mojave Desert bioregion, the Sierra Nevada, Great Basin, and San Joaquin Valley bioregions and manages nearly 1.8 million acres of public lands in Kern, Inyo, Mono, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties. The RFO public lands hosted more than 900,000 visitors in fiscal year 2008 providing a variety of recreation opportunities that include: casual motorized OHV trail riding for all-terrain vehicles, motorcycles, sand rails, four-wheel driving and many other non-motorized activities such as hiking, backpacking, hang gliding, hunting, rock hounding, horseback riding, wildlife viewing, photography, rock climbing and mountain biking.

Route designation has been completed throughout the Ridgecrest Field Office with the exception of two management areas: those being the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions. The requested project funding would assist in beginning the planning process so that a vehicle route system can be designated within these areas.

Planning Objectives:

The 168,000 acres of land within the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions of the West Mojave (WEMO) planning area possess many unique recreational attractions and are located immediately adjacent to the city's of Ridgecrest and Inyokern in eastern Kern County. As a result, these two subregions are very popular recreational destinations for the local citizens as well as visitors from throughout California. These two subregions also possess many sensitive and important natural and cultural features including a National Register District and habitat for the state-listed Mohave ground squirrel and other sensitive species. Additionally, there are a number of private access needs that must be addressed including private parcels, commercial operations (such as quarries), and permitted facilities (guzzlers, communications sites). Due to all of these factors, local community interest in the nature of motorized access to be provided is very high.

Therefore, the BLM plans on establishing a Collaborative Access Planning Area for the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions (El Paso CAPA). A motorized vehicle access network would be designed for the El Paso CAPA through collaboration with local jurisdictions, stake holders, and the general public. The process would be conducted subject to certain biological and cultural resource criteria that would assure that the routes to be designated as open, closed, or limited would follow the principles of species and habitat protection used in the WEMO Plan. The final objective of this planning process is to be able to adopt this motorized vehicle route network as a component of the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan.

B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

The large increase of off-highway vehicle use that has occurred on the public lands has resulted in impacts to the natural and cultural resources found therein. Improved management of off highway vehicle use would allow the Bureau of Land Management to enhance opportunities for public enjoyment of their public lands including motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. Through the development of a designated route system we will be able to provide an ecologically sustainable recreational opportunity. Additionally, these subregions' close proximity to the communities of Ridgecrest and Inyokern provide diverse recreational opportunities for the residents along with a unique opportunity to encourage the growth of eco-tourism, special recreation permits (Dual Sport tours) and commercial filming in the region.

C. Statement of Activities

This project funding will assist in the first phase that will be undertaken and that is the assemblage of resource data so that a holistic view maybe made and considered during the development of the designated route system.

Project specific proposed actions include:

1. Map all existing vehicle use routes within the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions.
2. Inventory and develop GIS Data layers of recreational opportunities found within the sub-regions.
3. Develop GIS Data layers of the private access needs including private parcels, commercial operations (such as mining), and permitted facilities (water haul and communications sites).

4. Develop GIS Data layers of biological and cultural resources following the principles of species and habitat protection used in the WEMO Plan.
5. Complete inventory and mapping of riparian habitat adjoining significant roosts for Townsend's big-eared bats.
6. Complete monitoring and mapping of approximately 75 sites within the Last Chance Canyon National Register District along with the inventory of an additional 5,000 acres of high probability areas within the District.

D. List of Reports

Environmental Assessment

Decision Record and Amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Management Plan

Program Specialist Reports:

Botanical Resources

Cultural Resources

Recreation

Wildlife

Lands & Realty

Minerals

Grazing

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700119

1. Timeline for Completion

Attachments:

[Completion Timeline](#)

2. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents

3. Optional Project-specific Maps

Attachments:

[El Paso CAPA Overview Map](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Planning

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Planning	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>The BLM Ridgecrest Field Office (RFO) is located in the western Mojave Desert and is a transition zone between the West Mojave Desert bioregion, the Sierra Nevada, Great Basin, and San Joaquin Valley bioregions and manages nearly 1.8 million acres of public lands in Kern, Inyo, Mono, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties. The RFO public lands hosted more than 900,000 visitors in fiscal year 2008 providing a variety of recreation opportunities that include: casual motorized OHV trail riding for all-terrain vehicles, motorcycles, sand rails, four-wheel driving and many other non-motorized activities such as hiking, backpacking, hang gliding, hunting, rock hounding, horseback riding, wildlife viewing, photography, rock climbing and mountain biking. Route designation has been completed throughout the Ridgecrest Field Office with the exception of two management areas: those being the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions. The requested project funding would assist in beginning the planning process so that a vehicle route system can be designated within these areas.</p> <p>Planning Objectives: The 168,000 acres of land within the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions of the West Mojave (WEMO) planning area possess many unique recreational attractions and are located immediately adjacent to the city's of Ridgecrest and Inyokern in eastern Kern County. As a result, these two subregions are very popular recreational destinations for the local citizens as well as visitors from throughout California. These two subregions also possess many sensitive and important natural and cultural features including a National Register District and habitat for the state-listed Mohave ground squirrel and other sensitive species. Additionally, there are a number of private access needs that must be addressed including private parcels, commercial operations (such as quarries), and permitted facilities (guzzlers, communications sites). Due to all of these factors, local community interest in the nature of motorized access to be provided is very high.</p> <p>Therefore, the BLM plans on establishing a Collaborative Access Planning Area for the El Paso and Ridgecrest subregions (El Paso CAPA). A motorized vehicle access network would be designed for the El Paso CAPA through collaboration with local jurisdictions, stake holders, and the general public. The process would be conducted subject to certain biological and cultural resource criteria that would assure that the routes to be designated as open, closed, or limited would follow the principles of species and habitat protection used in the WEMO Plan. The final objective of this planning process is to be able to adopt this motorized vehicle route network as a component of the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan.</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Other-Recreation Branch Chief	519.000	45.000	HRS	11,677.50	11,677.50	23,355.00
	Other-Biologist	173.000	39.000	HRS	3,373.50	3,373.50	6,747.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Planning

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Resources Staff	120.000	40.000	HRS	0.00	4,800.00	4,800.00
	Other-Archeologist	932.000	40.000	HRS	18,640.00	18,640.00	37,280.00
	Other-Realty Specialist	40.000	30.000	HRS	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00
	Other-Geologist	40.000	45.000	HRS	0.00	1,800.00	1,800.00
	GIS Specialist	173.000	40.000	HRS	3,460.00	3,460.00	6,920.00
	Other-Administrative Staff	40.000	25.000	HRS	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	Other-Field Office Manager	40.000	65.000	HRS	0.00	2,600.00	2,600.00
	Total for Staff				37,151.00	48,551.00	85,702.00
2	Contracts						
	Other-Cultural Survey Team	1.000	50000.000	YR	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
	Other-Bat Survey Team	1.000	60000.000	EA	60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00
	Total for Contracts				110,000.00	0.00	110,000.00
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Misc Supplies to support Program	1.000	5000.000	YR	2,000.00	3,000.00	5,000.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	Field Vehicle	6.000	500.000	MOS	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Administrative Costs						
	Administrative Costs-10 Percent	1.000	14915.000	YR	0.00	14,915.00	14,915.00
	Total Program Expenses				149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00
	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES				149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Planning

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Planning

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	37,151.00	48,551.00	85,702.00	
2	Contracts	110,000.00	0.00	110,000.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	2,000.00	3,000.00	5,000.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	14,915.00	14,915.00	
Total Program Expenses		149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		149,151.00	69,466.00	218,617.00	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700119

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

This Planning Grant request is to assist in the development of GIS data layers through records reviews and in conjunction with non-ground disturbing inventories and data collection in the El Paso and Ridgecrest sub-regions. These tasks would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and thus this request is not considered a Project under CEQA regulations.

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700119

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points) ☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points) ☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Planning Project - Q 2.

A Planning Project - Page 1

2. The Planning Project would address the following 0

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on special-status species habitats
☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on cultural resources
☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions
☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on water quality
☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on other recreation uses
☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on adjacent lands.
☒ Potential impact to relationships between OHV Recreation and local residents
☐ Toxic or hazardous materials within a Project Area or adjacent property that may impact OHV Recreation
☒ Trail issues such as traffic patterns, trails closures, appropriate uses, etc.

B. Planning Project - Page 2

Explain each statement that was checked

Protection of special status species will be given special consideration and soil monitoring checklist will be utilized to address soil conditions. The effect of OHV recreation on cultural resources will be in full compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Water quality effects and the protection of riparian habitats will be addressed through the use of the limited designation for routes of travel. Potential conflicts between various recreational uses will be addressed through the inventory of recreation opportunities in the subregions and evaluation of the quality of experiences with input solicited from stake holders and partner groups in the planning process. Furthermore, by having local residents participate in the collaborative planning process we will be able to address potential issues and concerns over the impacts of OHV recreation on adjacent private lands and hopefully reduce the potential for negative relationships and feelings developing between OHV recreation and residents.

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 6 or more items checked (4 points) ☐ 4 to 5 items checked (3 points)
☐ 2 to 3 items checked (2 points) ☐ 1 or no items checked (No points)

3. Motorized Access - Q 3.

3. The Project would lead to improved facilities that provide motorized access to the following nonmotorized recreation opportunities 6

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each, up to a maximum of 6 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Camping ☒ Birding
☒ Hiking ☒ Equestrian trails
☐ Fishing ☐ Rock Climbing
☒ Other (Specify) [Hunting, Rockhounding, and

Hunting]

4. Public Input - Q 4.

4. The Project proposal was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: Maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The Ridgecrest Field Office staff have made presentations and participated in discussions at three different meetings to solicit public input into the development of this grant proposal. These public meetings have included: Ridgecrest Steering Committee, on February 26, 2009.
Friends of Jawbone, on February 18 and January 21, 2009.
Sierra Club's California and Nevada Wilderness and Desert Committees, on February 7 and 8, 2009

5. Stakeholder Input - Q 5.

5. If the Project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

If 'Yes', explain, specifically, how it would be 'substantial'. Identify stakeholders

The planning area has many significant recreational, natural, and cultural resources along with authorized users to be considered during the development of a motorized vehicle route management system. Planning will be developed in collaboration with a multitude of stake holders in the region including such parties as grazing permittees, right of way holders, mining claimants, local governments. In order for this planning process to be successful, significant input will be needed from these stakeholders so that their needs, interest and fellow publics are well represented throughout the process. This input will probably be solicited in several different formats including potential field trips, public open house meetings, and focus group meetings.

6. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 6.

6. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s)

Quail Unlimited, Friends of Jawbone, Gear Grinders Four Wheel Drive Club, Sierra Club, High Desert Multiple Use Coalition.

7. Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 7.

7. The Planning Project sustains OHV Opportunity in the following manner 9

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Project will develop management plans for existing OHV Opportunity (4 points)
☐ Project will complete environmental review for an OHV Development Project (3 points)
☒ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities adjacent to population centers (3 points)
☐ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity (2 points)

- ☒ Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes for an existing OHV Opportunity (2 points)

Explain each statement that was checked

The Ridgecrest and El Paso planning subregions abut the communities of Ridgecrest and Inyokern that have a population of twenty-five thousand citizens. These two areas serve as extended backyards for these community residents and provide a wide range of recreational opportunities including OHV riding, hiking, mountain biking, and rock hounding just to name a few. The final efforts of this planning effort will result in amending the management plan for the California Desert Conservation Area along with developing a designated OHV route system that provides for both traditional OHV recreation along with providing access to non-motorized recreational opportunities.

8. Identification of Funding Sources - Q 8.

8. Funds for implementing the completed plan have been identified 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (No points)

☐ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

Reference Document

9. Offsite Impacts - Q 9.

9. The Planning Project would address offsite impacts relative to the Project Area (e.g., sound, fugitive dust, runoff): 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

The development of a designated trail system will help reduce offsite impacts from such factors as sound and fugitive dust. Soil conditions will be considered during planning and will include route sustainability and manageability, which should reduce dust emissions. Fugitive dust emissions will also be reduced as implementation of the plan occurs and as closed routes are allowed to rehabilitate and soils start to stabilize. Noise and off site trespass should be reduced with the designation of this route system, because one of the goals is to educate the OHV user on where he can and cannot ride (i.e. private property).